HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XIII, No. 27 Saturday, July 7, 1956 Washington, D. C.

News Section

Printed in Two Sections

Polish Revolt: The news from Poland settles an argument which has gone on among members of Congress for more than a year or so. The question — hotly debated — was: Does there exist any real anti-Communist resistance movement behind the Iron Curtain? A year ago this month, many (including HUMAN EVENTS, July 23, 1955) contended that the resistance movement in Eastern Europe would suffer discouragement if Western Governments fraternized in high-level conferences with the Communist dictators of those countries. Those on the other side of the question always retorted: But there is no such resistance movement of any consequence, at least since 1953, when the Soviet masters brutally crushed violent revolts in East Germany and neighboring areas.

Today, such a thesis is obviously untenable. All news accounts agree that the uprising in Poznan was well organized and superbly synchronized with the arrival of foreign businessmen at the Poznan Fair — revealing clever planning dating back at least a year in advance. All accounts of the movement showed that it sprang from both middle class and working class elements — indicating that it reflected wide discontent against the Soviet masters among the Polish people. So real, indeed, does the anti-Soviet underground appear that many in Washington wonder if it isn't much bigger and more deep-seated than even its most optimistic admirers have ventured to suggest.

The Poznan uprising clearly holds immense promise — say students of such matters — because it is obviously a youth movement. Right after the last war, the underground was middle-aged in complexion, paramilitary in character, and strongly centralized in direction. Those who make it their business to study these affairs say that now the members of this resistance to Communism are quite young, on the average under 25, civilian, but divided equally among middle class and worker elements, and not at all centralized (because of security reasons). The authority is exerted locally, although there is liaison nationally and internationally between groups. (The youth phenomenon seems typical of conditions elsewhere in Eastern Europe; Eugene Lyons, in his article, "Stalin's Ghost as Scapegoat," May 12, 1956, reported that the average age of political prisoners in Soviet Russia was under 30.)

Why such a development as the new Polish underground had not been discovered by Western papers and intelligence services — that indeed is a question much discussed here. Washington officials scoff at Moscow's blame of Allen Dulles' Central Intelligence Agency. Washington press men think "laziness" is at the bottom of the reporting of American newspaper staffs in Western Europe. It is remarked that Cyrus Sulzburger, head of the *New York Times* Bureau in Europe, gave a rather glowing account of the serenity of conditions and acceptance of dictatorship by the Poles, after a visit to that country not long ago. He was not alone in such reporting. Nor did the journalists seem to awake and bestir themselves once the news of the uprising reached the Western world. Here, it is observed that little journalistic initiative was shown, save by the Hearst papers which by some means or other got a special correspondent to the scene within a few days. British papers apparently did better.

The story around the State Department has it that Allen Dulles and his CIA had arranged to have Vice President Nixon visit the European satellite countries (like Poland) at the end of his present global trip. After Poznan, Secretary John Foster Dulles discovered this plan and sharply ordered it cancelled.

Communists and Democrats: Democratic Senators shouted "gutter tactics" last week and got

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1956 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the equivalent of an apology from Republican Senator H. Alexander Smith (N.J.). The anger of the Democrats was directed at a staff memorandum prepared by the Senate Republican Policy Committee saying that the Communists want Democrats to win.

In support of the GOP committee, it may be pointed out that the *Daily Worker* prints a great many stories favorable to Democratic Senators. On the other hand, excepting in the case of a few left-wing Republican Senators, the *Daily Worker* has only vilification for the GOP.

Veteran politicos here wonder why the GOP should make any retraction at all, and they ask why the Republican National Committee does not reply with numerous quotations available from the 1940, 1942 and 1944 campaigns. In those years, at the instigation of the White House, the theme song of leading Democratic spokesmen such as Ickes, Wallace and Lehman was: "Nazis Hope for GOP victory."

These veterans suggest that Chairman Len Hall should grab the chance to list the many errors made by FDR, Truman, Marshall and Acheson which allowed the Communists to capture 800 million people since 1939. "The Reds have good reason to be grateful to certain top Democratic symbols," conclude the strategists who believe the GOP should take the offensive.

Health: The President's health continues to improve at Gettysburg. However, after two upsets within one year, the members of the press covering the President are jittery — can't blame them. One story is that, on the cavalcade to Gettysburg, the President's car stopped unexpectedly. Newsies jumped out nervously — only to find that the chauffeur simply needed to adjust something in the motor. Examples of this morbid watchfulness multiply. Eyes are riveted on July 20, the day when the President is scheduled to visit the President of Panama in the latter's capital. Will he keep the appointment? Someone remarked: "Even for a strong, healthy individual, a trip to Panama in July is sufficient to cause an illness."

Truman this week said he hoped the "health" issue would be kept out of the campaign. But, it is pointed out, Truman and the Democratic candidates need never mention the health issue — the damage is done and will continue to be done by the same crowd of crypto-Democrats in the press and radio.

So, in such ticklish atmosphere, Vice President Nixon on departing for abroad was noticeably careful in what he said about the President running again. This was noted in press circles. Also Miss Bertha Adkins, Assistant to Chairman Hall of the National Republican Committee, while saying that Ike would run, took the trouble to add that the Republican Party has "a great many capable people" who could run for President "if for any reason" the Eisenhower-Nixon team does not run again. (Washington *Star*—June 30, 1956.)

One of the highest officials in the GOP was quoted as saying recently, "Of course, the President will run." But privately this figure said to us, "Of course, I don't know whether he will or not. I just hope he will."

Hoosier Independence: Conservative Indiana Republicans last week decisively defeated the "liberals." The former overwhelmingly voted for Harold W. Handley (at present Lieutenant Governor) to run as the GOP nominee for Governor next fall. They won against the bitter opposition of the "liberals" headed by incumbent Governor George N. Craig (who is now retiring). The convention result climaxed a four-year-old struggle since Craig's election in which the Governor has continuously sought to entrench the "liberals" in power at the expense of the "conservatives." Handley was backed by the powerful Senator William E. Jenner, leader of the conservative wing of the party, and therefore many papers speak of the outcome as a "Jenner victory."

The platform of the state party also contains two rather significant planks — (1) one wholeheartedly condemning Federal Aid to Education; and (2) another supporting right-to-work laws banning compulsory unionism. Handley's conquest of Craig is also a defeat for the forces backing foreign aid — for Craig is an internationalist of the globaloney variety. Appraising the Indiana events, Capital politicos now classify Indiana with Wisconsin (see that state's GOP repudiation of internationalist Senator Wiley) as two states which are playing it "independent."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

That 'Campaign Book' *Eisenhower: The Inside Story*, by Robert T. Donovan (Harpers), based in part on hitherto secret White House files and cabinet minutes, is scarcely drawing much praise from the higher echelon of the GOP on Capitol Hill. Some of the Republican leaders believe it to be an incredible piece of indiscreet bungling by heads of the White House Palace Guard which gave Donovan access to the material; others, somewhat melodramatically, cite it as another example of some secret "influence" in the White House seeking deliberately to sabotage the GOP. Both see in it the cause of a probable loss of votes for the Party in the coming elections.

They cite as one example the disclosure that Ike in 1953 actually talked of ditching the GOP and forming a "third party." The effect of such a revelation — it is claimed — will prove harmful to GOP party cadres in many areas. Also the revelation by Donovan that Ike classified GOP Senator McCarthy as a "gutter" type, in those words, will hardly help out much in such places as the New York borough of Queens, where a revolt of "McCarthyites" against the GOP in the 1954 elections affected enough votes to lose the Governorship. It was no accident, say critics of the book, that these passages got into *The Inside Story*; the volume, they say, betrays a pattern of careful selection of material which, in the interests of the GOP, should have been kept out.

Whose is the responsibility? No one blames Max Rabb, Secretary of the Cabinet, for giving out such material. Rabb is just a subordinate official and a careful one at that. He would never — it is believed — release such dangerous material without receiving orders "from upstairs." Was it Sherman Adams? Was it Milton Eisenhower?

What depresses GOP people on Capitol Hill is the realization that the Democrats are going to exploit such material to the utmost in the developing campaign. In the Capital cloakrooms, Democrats gleefully say they will.

Right to Work: A general misinterpretation of the Supreme Court's decision last May in the Nebraska railway labor case comes to light with issuance of a mandate by the Douglas County, Nebraska, District Court where the case originated.

Reports on the Supreme Court's decision, at the time it was issued on May 21, said it upheld the so-called union shop, whereby all employees are required to join the collective bargaining union within 60 days after their employment, in the railway industry, despite state right-to-work laws barring union shop agreements. The decision was based on 1951 legislation whereby Congress specifically authorized union shop contracts under the Railway Labor Act.

But now, with issuance of the trial court's mandate, it develops that what the Supreme Court did was simply to require that railway employees pay to unions regular "periodic dues, initiation fees and assessments." It did not require that the workers join any union.

Furthermore, the Court's opinion, delivered by Justice William O. Douglas, took specific note of charges that money paid into union treasuries might be used for political or other purposes repugnant to the beliefs of individual members contributing to those treasuries. But no facts to support such contentions were presented in the case on which the Court was acting, it said.

In what many attorneys now regard as a virtual invitation to bring other litigation raising the particular point, Douglas' opinion said:

"If other conditions are in fact imposed, or if the exaction of dues, initiation fees, or assessments is used as a cover for forcing ideological conformity or other action in contravention of the First Amendment, this judgment will not prejudice the decision in that case."

The words, and their implications, are being studied carefully with a view to possible legal action by compulsory but dissatisfied members of unions blatantly engaging in partisan politics, such as the left-wing United Automobile Workers.

Less Right to Work: While reconsideration of the Supreme Court decision now leads attorneys to believe it furthered, rather than derogated, the so-called "right-to-work" theory, the right-to-work law movement suffered a serious setback in Louisiana with repeal of the state's statute of that type.

Governor Earl Long signed the repeal measure amid fanfare and acclaim by labor unions, which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are hailing the action as a signal for renewed efforts on their part in the 17 states still having right-to-work laws on their books.

Observers in the state view the successful repeal campaign as a political victory for Louisiana unions. Apparently what made it possible was concerted union action against a selected few members of the state legislature who had supported the now-defunct law, and their replacement with legislators pledged to its repeal.

Letter from L. J. WILLETT, *1955 Commander, American Legion, Department of Minnesota:* "HUMAN EVENTS is uncompromising. Its 'let the chips fall where they may' policy of clearcut reporting is a welcome relief from 'neutral' or 'wishy-washy' publications."

Aid to Higher Education: With the spotlight focussed entirely on the bitter fight over Federal aid to local public school systems, a move is quietly gaining momentum to initiate a new drive for a program of Federal aid to educational institutions beyond the high school level — colleges and universities.

With virtually no publicity, a House Education and Labor Subcommittee is considering, and probably is about to approve, a bill authorizing a new White House Conference on Higher Education. It would be similar in format to last December's notoriously phony White House Conference on Education which, according to plan, discovered a tremendous grass roots sentiment in favor of a huge Federal aid program (a sentiment which still is invisible except to advocates of the program).

The new bill authorizes an appropriation of $800,000 to cover costs of establishing special committees in each state to consider the problems of education beyond the high school level, as a preliminary to the proposed conference. No date for it has yet been established, but guesses are that if the legislation is approved it will be held this winter, perhaps again in December.

The Department of Health, Education and Welfare is pushing vigorously for immediate passage of the bill, which was introduced only last month. In the hectic whirl of the annual rush for adjournment of Congress, observers fear it is quite likely that the measure may be slipped through.

Book Event: *The Free Man's Library*, by Henry Hazlitt, published by Van Nostrand, New York, $3.50, is a descriptive and critical bibliography of works on the philosophy of individualism by one of America's most accomplished and widely read authorities on economics and finance.

Mr. Hazlitt, in revealing the wealth, depth and breadth of the literature of freedom, has included works which explain the processes and advantages of free enterprise and free markets, recognize the evils of excessive state power, and champion the cause of individual freedom of worship, speech and thought.

He places in your hands the intellectual weapons to defend your freedom. Over 550 entries representing classics, historic and contemporary — authors from Aristotle to Rebecca West, those books that expound the positive philosophy of freedom and individualism and those attacking Communism and socialism — are included.

Here for the layman or the professional economist is a unique introduction to important literature that will focus and mobilize the intellectual forces for freedom and individualism so urgently needed today.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 6 weeks for $1.
Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.
By first class mail, $12 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $14 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $13 a year; airmail, $18.
Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.
1955 Bound Annual Volume with complete Index $15. All Bound Volumes for years prior to 1955 have been sold.
The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, WILLIS J. BALLINGER

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1956.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Volume XIII, No. 27 HUMAN EVENTS July 7, 1956

Article Section

The bill providing for Federal aid to public housing construction stands before Congress. It may be jammed through, or it may be defeated, or it may be dropped for this session — as often happens in the busy last lap before adjournment. Whatever the outcome, the fight against public housing must go on. If conservative elements exert one-third as much effort against any such legislation, as is being continuously applied year after year by advocates of public housing, they will win.

PAYING YOUR NEIGHBOR'S RENT
The Public Housing Program

By RUSSELL TURNER

A LONG-TIME Republican member of Congress from Pennsylvania named Robert Rich became famous around the Capitol during the 1930's and 40's for a simple question he invariably posed whenever a New Deal spending program was brought up for House consideration.

"Where are you going to get the money?" Rich's voice would boom out.

The question was appropriate during the many years he asked it. It is appropriate today in connection with many Government spending programs which now have come to be accepted as part of American life. It is peculiarly appropriate to the perennial wail of the liberal-left for public housing.

In all cases, of course, the answer to Rich's question is from you and me and all other American taxpayers.

In some cases, the expenditures are justified on grounds they are for the benefit of the entire nation, of all the taxpayers who contribute toward them. But in other cases, such as public housing, the expenditures amount to taxing all for the benefit of a few, no matter how their liberal advocates may seek to clothe them in the garb of "general welfare."

Taxpayers, throughout the country, have been contributing for 20 years to costs of the Tennessee Valley Authority program so that residents of that area might enjoy cheaper electricity. For almost as long, they have been contributing toward making possible cheap power rates to residents of the Pacific Northwest within range of the Bonneville power complex.

Public housing is an even more aggravated instance of unadulterated socialism having crept into our American life. This one directly penalizes the thrifty and the provident who own their own homes, with the penalty tax payments being redistributed to the benefit of a selected few who for political or other reasons have been granted the privilege of an apartment in a public housing project. Frequently, the recipients of this governmental largesse have more income than millions of those who ante up taxes to make possible that largesse.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1956 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Thanks to the common sense of a majority of our national legislators, the public housing program still is relatively small; taxpaying Americans are footing the bill for dwellings for a comparatively small number of their compatriots. It would not be so if the liberal-left had its way.

Americans for Democratic Action is a self-styled "liberal" organization, numerically small but politically influential. Quite conceivably, it may succeed in its planned campaign to take over the Democratic National Convention next month. The "Domestic Policy" statement adopted by this spring's ADA national convention shows clearly what will be in store in the housing field if liberals win control of the national Government:

"A progressive shift to public housing for lower income families, because of its social urgency and to compensate for any saturation in the market for more expensive housing; coupled with an effective middle-income housing program backed by Federal credit.

"The housing goal is a proper dwelling in a suitable living environment for every American family, which requires an annual average of 2 million new homes for the next ten years to replace slums and keep up with population growth."

Immediate socialization of all housing for lower income groups, gradual repetition of the process for middle income bracket housing! Upper income groups apparently are to continue providing their own homes, in addition to contributing substantially to those of the first two categories. To the trash heap goes the American theory of individuals earning their own living.

As a sociological goal, the ADA aim — "a proper dwelling in a suitable living environment for every American family" — is Utopian. But ADA completely ignores the practical aspects—the regimentation inevitably attendant on any such program, the political implications bound to arise in assignment of choicest quarters, Mr. Rich's little question of how it is to be paid for.

Such mundane matters seemingly are beneath the dignity, and unworthy of consideration, of the lofty visionaries who make up ADA. Their entire policy statement, in fact, is devoted to items for which they say the Government should spend unspecified but vastly greater sums — public housing, a socialized medical system, increased public welfare grants, a food stamp plan, direct subsidies to farmers, myriad other projects. This is coupled, of course, with a demand for sharp decreases in Federal income taxes on lower and middle income classes. Never a word about how to pay for any part of it.

Nor, in the case of public housing, is there any hint of how they would replace revenue lost to local governments when property to be used for public housing projects is taken off their local tax rolls. Apparently they would let stand the present system whereby tax rates on other property owners in the community are increased sufficiently to offset the deficit created by elimination of the public housing property from the tax rolls.

This means, of course, that the frugal and the thrifty who have had the fortitude and good sense to purchase their own homes, contribute twice toward the welfare of the less-provident who rent quarters in public housing projects: by direct taxes to pay for the projects; and by higher real estate levies to make up for the local taxes which the public housing projects would pay if they were privately owned but, being publicly owned, do not pay.

It is not just the ADA which is advocating this socialization of housing. The public housing lobby's roster is long and politically impressive; the AFL-CIO, for example, throws its entire weight behind the campaign.

It might, of course, be pertinent to inquire what the reaction would be among wage-earning union members with incomes of, say, less than $3,500 a year, to knowledge that their union organization is advocating a program whereby they would pay taxes to subsidize cut rate housing facilities for a selected few families whose incomes may be $4,000, $5,000 or even more. Would they care for the idea?

The phrase "selected few families," is used advisedly. Most public housing projects are of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a sufficiently attractive character, with rentals set far lower than if they were paying their own way, so that the demand for their apartments is many times greater than the available supply. In New York City, for example, where the city and state conduct supplemental programs in addition to the 8,000 units per year contracted for by the Federal Government, the total available supply now is about 30,000 new units a year. Close to 500,000 families have their names on the application rolls.

Inevitably, proven or promised political support can become a decisive factor in deciding which applicants will be accepted; and the projects can become a further means whereby those in control of Government can operate to perpetuate that control.

The basic theoretical purpose of public housing is to provide facilities for lower income families who have been living in slums or other substandard quarters. To carry out this intent, rents in public housing developments have no relation whatsoever to actual cost of the project. Instead, they are based on the individual tenant's income and his ability to pay. The general rule of thumb is that the rent shall be approximately 20 per cent of the family's income, with the rent including all utilities.

As an example, a $20,800,000 public housing project known as the Christopher Columbus homes, with 1,556 units, was opened last August in Newark, N.J.; average cost per unit, $13,367. The project includes a health clinic, a library, hobby shops, an auditorium equipped for motion picture showings.

Louis Danzig, executive director of the Newark Housing Authority, proudly told newsmen that comparable privately-owned apartments rented for at least $125 a month, whereas the average rental in his project (based on an average income per family of $200 a month) would be "$40 a month, with the rent charge including gas, electricity, heat, hot water, gas range and refrigerator."

"If that doesn't make our apartments a genuine bargain, I don't know what does," he said.

It certainly does — for the tenants. But what is it for the millions of taxpayers who must make up the difference between the $40 a month charged for the Christopher Columbus project apartments, and the close to $125 a month it actually costs to amortize and operate the project? Or for the Newark property owners who must make up for the taxes not being collected on this $20,800,000 project?

Equally as inherent in public housing as the political machine-building, is the constant specter of unwarranted and unwanted Government regulation of the private lives of residents.

In the article, "This Was the House of Our Fathers," in the March 19, 1955, HUMAN EVENTS, James J. Kilpatrick told of the overzealous manager of a public housing project in the little town of Hopewell, Virginia, who decreed that in his project there should be no pet animals, no electric light bulbs larger than 60 watts, and no drinking whatsoever of any intoxicating liquors. The public furor was great, not only in Hopewell but around the country; the project manager beat a hasty retreat. Nevertheless, the power is there; equally noxious regulations can seep in gradually but inexorably to restrict the liberties and private lives of public housing tenants.

Because Congress has been persistently chary of undertaking any big-scale public housing program such as is sought by the liberal-left, there are only about 450,000 such units in existence or in stages of being under contract, going back to the days when the first public housing program was started as a Public Works project back in 1934. For these units, Congress now is appropriating approximately $87,000,000 a year as the Federal contribution to their amortization and operation — contributions which are to extend over 40 years, putting the ultimate total cost to Federal taxpayers well up in the billions of dollars.

Public housing projects make token "in lieu of taxes" payments to the local community, but they do not even come close to the amount that would be paid on the project if it were privately owned. Estimates of amounts lost to local governments because of this non-taxability of public

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

housing range up to half the Federal subsidy, or in excess of $40,000,000 annually; a sum which must be made up by residents of the community not privileged to enjoy the Federal bounty.

Many communities, as a matter of fact, have affirmatively turned down proposed public housing projects when they learn what the projects will cost in the form of lost taxes and direct outlays. Disregarding impassioned pleas of lefties, plebiscites of voters have resulted in their rejection in community after community.

DESPITE the lack of Congressional enthusiasm, the liberals are expanding their public housing demands rather than backing down. The middle income program is a development of recent years; of even more recent vintage is a growing demand for a special housing program to care for persons over 60 years of age, know facetiously as the "Townsend housing plan." Thus, the housing bill pending in Congress makes special provision for liberalization of Federal Housing Administration credit terms for elderly persons, for their acceptance in public housing projects, and for construction of 10,000 public housing units a year especially designed for them. A vote-buying bonanza for the demagogues; after this, will come the extravaganza of vote-luring promises of the better free life for the aged. As always, no mention of the slight item of answering Mr. Rich's question.

Probably the most effective, and undoubtedly the most outspoken opponent of public housing, is the National Association of Real Estate Boards. Liberals rant that the NAREB typifies the mossback reactionary hatred for all social progress.

But is socialized housing progress? Is it progress to tax all, even prudent and thrifty low income earners, for the benefit of the few, inincluding the improvident and the spendthrift? Is it progress to abandon the free enterprise American way of life which many believe has served this country well throughout its history?

The liberals pooh-pooh, and brush aside as irrelevant, the fact that the NAREB has its own plan for eliminating slums and generally improving the presently-substandard housing available to lower income groups. Operated in conjunction with other groups such as the National Association of Home Builders, the plan is carried out by private enterprise in cooperation with local authorities and already has proven highly successful in many cities.

It is patterned after amazingly-effective clean-up campaigns which were conducted in Baltimore, Maryland, and Charlotte, North Carolina. It is simple, but requires the hearty support of local civic organizations possessing a sincere desire to accomplish the job.

The ingredients are first, an intense campaign to compel compliance with local health and building codes (preceded by adoption of effective and adequate codes, if they are not already included in local ordinances); and secondly, a campaign to make slum and substandard dwelling owners realize that they will be aiding not only their tenants but themselves as well, if they will rehabilitate and modernize their properties. It has been effective in many cities; it can be made effective in others.

Widely known as the "Baltimore plan" after its first successful operation in a major city, this is private enterprise's answer to the public housing lobby. It is an effective answer; it can, and must, be made to work.

The alternative may well be expansion of the doctrine of taxing all for the benefit of the few.

Additional copies of this 4-page Article: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $20 per thousand.

Russell Turner, a Washington, D. C., newsman for 22 years, is staff assistant to Fulton Lewis, Jr., National Radio Commentator. Mr. Turner also serves as Washington correspondent for *Partners*, Chicago monthly magazine covering the field of labor-management relations. His last article appeared in HUMAN EVENTS on May 5, 1956 — "Unionism: The Growing Big Business."

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS for new subscribers only: 6 weeks for $1.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED